

CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

One Liberty Plaza
 New York, NY 10006-1470
 T: +1 212 225 2000
 F: +1 212 225 3999
 clearygottlieb.com

WASHINGTON, D.C. • PARIS • BRUSSELS • LONDON • MOSCOW
 FRANKFURT • COLOGNE • ROME • MILAN • HONG KONG • BEIJING
 BUENOS AIRES • SÃO PAULO • ABU DHABI • SEOUL • SILICON VALLEY

CRAIG B. BROD
 NICOLAS CRABAR
 RICHARD J. COOPER
 JEFFREY S. LEWIS
 PAUL J. SHIM
 STEVEN L. WILNER
 DAVID C. LOPEZ
 MICHAEL A. GERSTENZANG
 LEV L. DASSIN
 JORGE U. JUANTORENA
 MICHAEL D. WEINBERGER
 DAVID LEINWAND
 DIANA L. WOLLMAN
 JEFFREY A. ROSENTHAL
 MICHAEL D. DAYAN
 CARMINE D. BOCCUZZI, JR.
 JEFFREY D. KARP
 KIMBERLY BROWN BLACKLOW
 FRANCISCO LESTERO
 FRANCESCO L. ODELL
 WILLIAM L. MCRAE
 JASON FACTOR
 JOON H. KIM
 MARGARET S. PEPPEROS
 LISA M. SCHWEITZER
 JUAN G. GIRALDEZ
 DUANE MC LAUGHLIN
 CHANTAL E. KORDULA
 BENET J. O'REILLY
 ADAM E. FLEISHER
 SEAN A. O'NEAL
 GLENN P. MCGRORY

MATTHEW P. SALERNO
 MICHAEL J. ALBANO
 VICTOR L. HOU
 ROGER A. COOPER
 LILLIAN TSU
 AMY R. SHAPIRO
 JENNIFER KENNEDY PARK
 ELIZABETH LENAS
 LUKE A. BAREFOOT
 JONATHAN S. KOLODNER
 DANIEL ILAN
 MEYER H. FEDIDA
 ADRIAN R. LEIPSIC
 ELIZABETH VICENS
 ADAM J. BRENNEMAN
 ARI D. MACKINNON
 JAMES E. LANGSTON
 JARED GERBER
 ROBERT J. STONE
 JANE VALIARE
 DAVID H. HERRINGTON
 KIMBERLY R. SPOERRI
 AARON J. MEYERS
 DANIEL C. REYNOLDS
 AUDRY X. CASUSOL
 JOHN A. KUPIEC
 ABENAA A. MAINOO
 HUGH C. CONROY, JR.
 JOSEPH LANZKRON
 MAURICER R. GINDI
 KATHERINE R. REAVES
 RAHUL MUKHI

ELANA S. BRONSON
 MANUEL SILVA
 KYLE A. HARRIS
 LINA BENSMAN
 ARON M. ZUCKERMAN
 KENNETH S. BLAZEJEWSKI
 MARK E. MCDONALD
 F. JAMAL FULTON
 PAUL V. IMPERATORE
 CLAYTON SIMMONS
 CHARLES W. ALLEN
 RESIDENT PARTNERS

JUDITH KASSEL
 PENELOPE L. CHRISTOPHOROU
 BOAZ S. MORAG
 MARIE A. ALCONK
 HILARY E. BENFRITZ
 ANDREW W. EVERETT
 HELENA K. GRANNIS
 JOHN V. HARRISON
 LAURA BAGARELLA
 JONATHAN D.W. GIFFORD
 SUSANNA E. PARKER
 DAVID W.S. YUDIN
 KARA A. HAILEY
 ANNA KOGAN
 BRANDON M. HAMMER
 RESIDENT COUNSEL

D: +1 212-225-2086
 jrosenthal@cgsh.com

VIA ECF

January 26, 2022

The Honorable Ona T. Wang
 United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
 Daniel Patrick Moynihan Courthouse
 500 Pearl Street
 New York, NY 10007

Re: *In re Application of Vale S.A. et al.*, No. 20-mc-199-JGK-OTW

Dear Judge Wang:

On behalf of Vale S.A., Vale Holdings B.V., and Vale International S.A. (collectively, “Vale”), we regret having to seek the Court’s assistance in ordering – for the fourth time – Perfectus Real Estate Corp. (“Perfectus”) to appear for its Rule 30(b)(6) deposition as ordered by this Court on January 6, 2022, ECF 117, January 13, 2022, ECF No. 122, and January 19, 2022, ECF No. 124.

Despite this Court’s multiple orders, Perfectus’s latest tactic has been to advise us that it will refuse to answer questions related to the majority of the topics set out in Vale’s Notice of Deposition (Exhibit A). Perfectus has long been aware of these topics as they were largely set forth in the subpoena for Rule 30(b)(6) testimony that Vale served on Perfectus on December 1, 2021 and subsequently filed with the Court on December 2, 2021. ECF 111, Exhibit 5. While the Court denied Vale’s request for a deposition at that time without prejudice on the basis that Vale should first review Perfectus’s additional productions, Your Honor subsequently ordered the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Perfectus on January 6, 2022. ECF 117. Vale thereafter served Perfectus with an updated subpoena and Notice of Deposition, *see* Exhibit A, which did not deviate in substance from the Rule 30(b)(6) topics contained in Vale’s original subpoena that was submitted to the Court on December 2, 2021. These topics are all well within the scope of Vale’s § 1782 Application:

The Honorable Ona T. Wang, p. 2

- Perfectus's historic and actual ownership structure and its relationship (if any) to Beny Steinmetz and Dag Cramer, defendants in the underlying English proceedings¹ (Deposition Topics 1, 6-10);
- Perfectus's relationship with David Barnett, counsel and advisor to Mr. Steinmetz (Deposition Topic 11);
- Perfectus's relationship with HFZ Capital Group (and its officers and directors), with whom Perfectus and Steinmetz have both engaged in real estate transactions (Deposition Topics 5, 12);
- Any funds paid by Vale to BSG Resources Limited ("BSGR") that were subsequently invested with or provided in any manner to Perfectus, directly or indirectly (Deposition Topic 4);
- Perfectus's process for collecting and reviewing documents in response to Vale's subpoena (Deposition Topics 2, 3, 13-16).²

Notwithstanding that it has known about and never objected to Vale's deposition topics for nearly two months, and that this Court has twice had to order Perfectus to appear for the deposition, ECF Nos. 117, 122, Counsel for Perfectus several days ago advised Vale that it will instruct its witness not to testify as to any questions related to topics 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 at the deposition, which is scheduled to go forward in a week's time on February 2 in Milan, Italy. Counsel for Perfectus has offered no reason why it contends that these topics are not relevant and has refused Vale's multiple offers to meet and confer on these topics. Moreover, even though it is plainly *Perfectus's* burden to seek a Protective Order, it has declined to do so.³

Given the significant time and expense that will be wasted next week should Perfectus refuse to answer most questions at its February 2 deposition, as well as the urgency given that this deposition is already occurring after the start of the English trial (because of Perfectus's prior non-compliance and then Vale's agreement to Perfectus's request for an extension of the deposition deadline), Vale respectfully requests that the Court promptly issue yet another order

¹ Claim No. CL-2019-000723 in the High Court of Justice, Business and Property Courts of England and Wales, Commercial Court (QBD).

² Counsel for Perfectus has not indicated its intent to instruct its witness against testifying as to these particular deposition topics.

³ See, e.g., *Moore's Federal Practice – Civil* § 30.50 ("A party unwilling to comply with a deposition notice should file a motion for a protective order."); *Fort Worth Emps. 'Ret. Fund v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.*, No. 09 Civ. 3701, 2013 WL 6439069, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 9, 2013) (collecting cases and noting that it is the deponent's burden to seek a protective order for objections to the scope of the 30(b)(6) deposition notice); *Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters, Airline Div. v. Frontier Airlines, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-02007, 2013 WL 627149, at *6-7, *9 (D. Colo. Feb. 19, 2013) (finding that the deponent "had the responsibility to file a motion for protective order regarding disputed issues" as to the scope of topics to be covered in the deposition); *New England Carpenters Health Benefits Fund v. First DataBank, Inc.*, 242 F.R.D. 164, 166 (D. Mass. 2007) (noting that if the deponent is of the view that the "deposition notice was defective or improper in some way" or that the information sought was obtainable through less burdensome means, then it is the deponent's burden to seek a protective order).

The Honorable Ona T. Wang, p. 3

compelling Perfectus to appear for deposition and answer questions on all of the Rule 30(b)(6) topics.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeffrey A. Rosenthal

Jeffrey A. Rosenthal

jrosenthal@cgsh.com

Lisa M. Schweitzer

lschweitzer@cgsh.com

Lisa Vicens

evicens@cgsh.com

CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

One Liberty Plaza

New York, New York 10006

T: 212-225-2000

F: 212-225-3999

Counsel for Vale S.A., Vale Holdings B.V., and Vale International S.A.